DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 628 HE 029 258

AUTHOR Garavalia, Brian J.
TITLE A Descriptive Study of the Illinois International Education Policy Study Committee: A State Mandated Committee To Develop a Policy for the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act.
PUB DATE Jul 96
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; *Agenda Setting; Change Strategies; College Governing Councils; *Educational Policy; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; *Policy Formation; *Political Influences; *Strategic Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois Higher Education International Educ Act

ABSTRACT

This monograph examines policy formation practices of the Illinois International Education Policy Study Committee (PSC) concerning implementation of the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act. In the first section, a review of the literature on various aspects of policy and policy considerations is offered including a definition of policy, the needs and purposes of policy, its sources, data for consideration when developing policy, internal policy prods to action, and the impact of politics on policy. The second section describes four policy authors' policy processes and combines them into one 10-step policy process. The third section presents observations on the PSC's five consolidated meetings including a description of the PSC's methods to policy formation and the implications of each policy formation step. The conclusion identifies those actions seen to be responsible for successful policy formation in the PSC policy process. These include: (1) having one impartial person coordinating and controlling the entire policy process; (2) obtaining the support of a wide array of policy agents and policy agents (such as state level officials) and policy target populations (individual institutions); (3) knowledge contributions by policy agents and policy target populations; and (4)ensuring the capacity of both policy agent and target population groups to implement the policy. (Contains 16 references.) (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 628

A Descriptive Study of the Illinois International Education Policy Study Committee: A State Mandated Committee to Develop Policy for the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act

Dr. Brian J. Garavalia
Adjunct Assistant Professor
Department of Vocational Education
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, Georgia 31698-0080
U. S. A.
Office: (912) 333-5928
e-mail: bgaraval@grits.valdosta.peachnet.edu

(Preferable correspondence)
2092 Sherwood Dr. South, Bldg. C-19
Valdosta, GA 31602
Home: (912) 249-9229

Running Head: Policy Study Committee

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 029 257

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Brian J. Garavalia
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

After the passage of the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act, the state General Assembly charged the Illinois Board of Higher Education with convening a state-wide committee (Policy Study Committee (PSC)) to formulate policy to operate and manage the legislation. Framing policy issues through literature review, several policy characteristics were identified and described. Also, policy formation processes from four policy authors were reviewed, and by eclectically selecting specific policy steps from each author, one ten-step policy formation (theoretic) process was developed. Finally, both the theoretic and the PSC policy formation processes were compared and contrasted for similarities and differences, and for validating both policy processes.

Introduction

The state of Illinois, has, for several years attempted to pass various forms of international education legislation such as international studies and foreign language initiatives, all without success. The federal government, the National Governors Association and others have expressed great concerns for the nation's educational system, primarily that of the elementary and secondary levels, most of which stemming from the early 1980s. Concerns were focused on the perceived poor performance by the educational systems in preparing U.S. students in a variety of areas, but was manifested primarily in poor test scores and comparisons of American students and their foreign counterparts. Those concerns resulted in a series of commissions and reports describing the lack of preparedness of U.S. students, and prescribed means to counteract them. A few of the better known reports are: Action for Excellence (Education Commission of the United States, 1983), Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform (United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), and Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (National Institute of Education, 1984).[1] As a result of the myriad of national commissions and reports, individual states were encouraged to begin seeking solutions to rectify the problems of their individual educational system.

I investigated policy formation from a practical or applicable perspective. Qualitatively speaking, from an ethnographic approach to this investigation, I recognize policy as a process that is in constant flux, involving timely and accurate data, policy agents, and policy targets: all exposed to

political filtration. Although this investigation is directed at international education, I describe policy formation in generic terms (policy formation that fits within the structure of academe or the corporate world), utilizing a logical and rational decision making process. More specifically, I refer to state level policy that focuses on a governing board (Illinois Board of Higher Education) in its relation to the higher education institutions (inter-state post secondary education), both levels ultimately affecting the three areas of research, public service, and instruction. In the first section, I discuss the various aspects of policy and policy considerations. First, I define policy and its intent. Second, I discuss the needs and purposes for policy. Third, I present from whom and where policy originates. Fourth, I suggest specific questions, considerations, and data to reflect when developing policy. Fifth, I offers suggestions regarding policy tools (internal policy prods to evoke action). Sixth, I question the impact politics has on policy.

In the second section, I briefly describe four policy authors' policy processes, and eclectically select and combine them into one ideal ten-step policy process. In the third section, I describe my observations of the Illinois Board of Higher Education International Education Policy Study Committee's summarized and consolidated meetings 1 through 5. I describe the Policy Study Committee's (PSC) methods to policy formation. In addition, I discuss each policy formation step and its implications, then I follow-up describing the Committee's actions in relation to the corresponding policy step. I conclude by briefly summarizing the investigation, noting those actions specifically responsible for the success of the policy formation, and tying in those actions in relation to current and future policymakers.

Policy

Policy defined

Policy is, according to Good (1973), "a judgment, derived from some system of values and assessment of situational factors, operating as a general plan for guiding decisions regarding the means of attaining desired objectives" (p. 428). Hough (1984) explains policy as a series of steps with goal directed actions.

> Policy, then, is focused on purposive or goal oriented action or active rather than random or chance behaviour. It refers to courses or patterns of action, rather than separate discrete decisions; usually policy development and application involves a number of related decisions, rather than a single decision. (p. 14)

Policy does not have one definition, but many, and Caws (1972) states that "policy serves to translate institutional objectives into the context of everyday efforts" (p. 41). There are many ways to describe policy and Nagel (1990) suggests that policy entails

> 1) purposive action, directed toward problems or goals; 2) action taken by government agents, or collectivities that can be defined as agents of government; 3) rules that specify who is to do what, when, why, and how; 4) tools that provide incentives and motivations for individuals to undertake the policy-preferred behavior; and 5) causal theories that link actions of agents to behavior of targets and the behavior of targets to outcomes. (p. 79)

According to Nagel, policy implies intentionality. Policy is not, necessarily, rigid top to bottom control. Policy design is a product of many ideas and compromises, and policy rules typically specify actions or decisions that are required, prohibited, or permitted.

The Need/Purpose for Policy

Suggested above, policy expresses rationale, organized, and well articulated intentionality: creating a guiding document helps establish the importance and priority of the intention. Directed at internationalizing postsecondary education campuses, Backman (1984) declared that the most important goal for the United States' higher education is to prepare Americans for the 21st century. He stated that it can only be accomplished through well thought out policies, guidelines, and programs that lead students to an international perspective. McKelvie (1986) and Kaplan (1987) also believed that policy must clearly express the raison 'etre of the institution to concerned publics, and that the lack of clearly articulated policy leads to haphazard results. Davies (1985), too, supported the need for policy. He noted that with the amount of environmental turbulence, and the explicit and overt pressures from internal and external constituencies, more rational frameworks of policy development are needed. Backman (1984) added that many campuses lack statements of mission or goals, and that the purpose of the policy statement "is to declare officially the institution's international mission. This statement serves as the standard to which specific goals, objectives, and actions can be compared. Policy offers justification for the steps the institution takes in implementing necessary changes" (pp. 333-334). Concurring with the above authors, both Ping (1990) and Audas (1991) suggested that one of the first steps to successful internationalization is through rhetoric (discussion), policy and goals which should be voiced, then extended to written policy and goals. Ideally, then, policy and goals would be extended into actions. These documents set decision making parameters,

direct decisional flow, and protect against inner-institutional parochial beliefs and interests of collegial groups/units that are not in sink with the overall institutional view. Through the discussion by university leadership of these policy/planning documents, policy verbiage can be translated into precise actions. Written policy not only serves as an enabling document to institutions but also becomes qualified statements of institutional philosophy.

From Whom and From Where Does Policy Flow?

Policy can, and does come from numerous agents and constituencies, and its flow is multi-directional. The following authors' suggested that policy can be legislated from within or outside of government, business, and education: Policy flow varies according to public or private, and hierarchical level in society. Considering the potential number of persons having policy input, who controls the policy intent? Lindblom (1968) suggested several options as to those individuals who might or might not control policy in the policy making process: (a) No rational control--recognizes that no single individual or group gets credit for the policy. The process is so complex, full of confused interplay and voices from each side, that identification of one author is not possible; (b) an official elite--recognizes that those given official status have substantially more influence over policy than those viewed as ordinary citizens. Policy makers and other politicians are those persons recognized as having official status, and that, because of the freedom (to do or not to do), they covet the political policy process; (c) an interest-group elite--recognizes that there are groups of persons with supreme interest in specific issues. This group can exert great influence on policy makers and policy; and (d) an establishment elite--recognizes that policy analysis is crucial in the policy

making process. Any person or group who can bring careful and skillfully crafted analysis relevant facts of information to the policy making process can wield considerable amount of influence on policy or the formulation process. Lindblom (1968) believed that policy making is such complicated process that who made it may be too difficult to describe. Accepting that policy is an intricate and collective process, leads us to believe that a variety of elites control policy. Adding to the complexity of policy formation, the environment one is within will dictate how policy is controlled. Caws, Ripley, and Ritterbush (1972) noted that within educational institutions policy is shared between constituencies, and constituencies are rarely in agreement on policy issues. The authors also mentioned that it is believed that institutions are not governed by policy, but rather by consensus. This wide variety of voices shaping policy may serve as some positive catalyst to change. Contrast to policy by consensus, opponents to the aforementioned believe that too many issues, points-of-view, and factionalism will result in hazy policy formulation and process. There is no doubt that policy is a complex interplay of constituents, environments, and politics: believing such might lead one to question how policy makers go about the policy formulation process. I am not referring to a "policy steps process" per se, but holistically referring to conditions or questions that factor into successful policy, e.g., pertinent data, circumstances of environment, target population and political policy support, just to name a few. Lindblom (1968) noted that the policy-making process is very complex and analytical, to which a beginning or ending is difficult to define and its boundaries unclear. Policy making is an intertwined set of forces swayed and manipulated by beliefs,

attitudes, actions, circumstances, and environment, which produce effects called policies. "Clearly, then, policy is molded by a variety of forces beyond those within the policy making system itself" (p. 4). Paramount is our knowledge of the intricate network of the policy making process which produces policy.

Policy Questions, Data, and Considerations

Christensen, Berg, and Salter (1980) mentioned that in formulating policy strategy one should consider the following three questions or situations, present and future. Where are we now? Where do we want to go? How do we get there? They suggested that these questions can be very difficult to answer. Nagel (1990) suggested that many decision makers simply refer to the past and what has been publicly accepted and successful through trial and error, but he also believes that one right strategy is not possible. "Nowhere does one find the saving selection formula that would tell decision makers what data to consider and what to ignore, or which belief would better be abandoned than perpetuated" (p. 4). The literature suggests that there is no one perfect way to design policy. Policy is dependent upon its circumstances and policy is designed by all surrounding factors. Because no one policy is right for all circumstances, Nagel (1990) offered the following, "The most appropriate behavioral strategies obviously are those that fit into the decision context" (p. 97). The following summarizes Nagel's three policy diagnostics for successful design: (a) The support diagnostic--proposes that for any policy to be successful it must have sufficient amount of support; (b) the knowledge diagnostic--proposes that policy is only as good as the information on which it is founded. Policy should be based on reliable and accurate information; and

(c) the capacity and incentive diagnostic--proposes that agents and target populations should have the ability and motivation to implement policy activities. (1990)

Understanding the complex interplay and mix of those who affect policy is crucial, no less important is policy data consideration. Keep in mind that policy is as good as the data it is founded on. For example, policy makers need to consider the timeliness and indeterminacy in data. Some authors have suggested that to wait for the right information is not possible. Policy makers, simply, do not have time to waste. Certain situations call for policy formulation, and when those times arise, available data must be utilized (timeliness). The other circumstance pertains to indeterminacy (truth or accuracy) of data. How are policy makers to know the validity and reliability of all potential data without testing it first? And even if the data can be tested first, how are policy makers to know if better data exist? This point brings me back to the first statement that there is not enough time to wait for what might be perfect. Though not discussed in this investigations, educational indicators may aid in the aforementioned inevitable problematic issues of policy formation.[2]

Policy Tools

Once policy has been carefully crafted; what incentives, motivators or directives have been stated, urging, willingly or unwillingly target policy population cooperation? Policy may serve as empty statements unless some internal and external prods are installed. Nagel (1990) briefly discusses the nature of policy tools:

> explicit or implicit incentives and other means imbedded in the policy that increase the probability of agents and targets taking action in

> concert with policy objectives...dimensions of interest are those involving the techniques the tools used to influence people. (p. 87)

Policy tools fit into five categorical areas: (a) Authority tools--influence behaviors through the existent of the built-in power of the hierarchical structure (line/staff); (b) incentive tools--are tangible payoffs which are used in the decision process to coax the target groups into desired policy action; (c) capacity building tools--require a stock of knowledge, information, resources, training, and other provisions (grants) to afford target group's necessary action for policy compliance; (d) symbolic and hortatory tools--seek through high government officials and other means to change perceptions and values of target group(s) through manipulative strategies (persuasive communication, public relations, etc.), but, in no way do they effect real payoffs. The individual's perceptions and values are directed at policy behaviors; and (e) learning tools--are mechanisms used for gaining feedback of previous policy action, or are reactions about prior actions of target group(s). Learning tools enable target groups through feedback to keep, revise, or disregard strategies as new situations arise. Choosing the right policy tools require answering two questions: What type of policy participation is needed in order to succeed? How well will the policy target groups receive the mix of policy proposals? (Nagel, 1990).

Politics and Policy

In final, and possibly the most important aspect with the least control influencing and impacting policy, is the long arm of politics. Should politics and policy be viewed as two separate and unrelated entities or accepted as two separate entities with very real connected and even intertwined relations? Some literature suggests that politics and policy are of the same intentions,

but politics is the process of the intention, and policy is the product of the intention, therefore one does lead to another. Nagel (1990), too, believes politics and policy are separate but intertwined. He noted that policy is simply not handed down from scientist to practitioner but is subject to political processing. "The outcomes of social research are not finished products that command certain actions of policies, but are data-raw materials to the political and organizational mill" (p. 3). Gove and Stauffer (1986) cited Wirt with whom they agreed. Wirt suggested that policy is not something that just happens, but is made through series of stages, and is complex and intentional process. Politics however refers to the interaction of competing factions over the formulation or outcome of policy. Gove and Stauffer (1986) stated concisely that, "Political activity may occur at each stage of the policy-making process. Put simply, policy is the 'what' of the process; politics deals with the 'how' and 'whom'" (p. 7).

Stated above, policy and politics are characterized as a hand-in-hand relationship, and accepting this proposition, one might question the independence (equality) of policy formulation from politics. Where does politics begin and end? When does politics hinder instead of provide assistance? How much data can be gathered and massaged in the policy formulation process before politics intercedes and does what it has to do? Does politics dominate policy formulation? Lindblom (1968) made reference to Smith and Castle's 1964 work. They answered in very limited manner the need for politics in policy formulation, but did not answer to what extent they overlap or connect with one another.

> There are all kinds of room for controversy over what 'the problem is', and no way to settle the controversy by analysis. Here already, then, is

> limit on analytic policy making, and necessary point of entry for 'politics' and other 'irrationalities' in policy making. (Lindblom, 1968, p. 14)

Politics therefore seems necessary to the policy formulation process, but to what extent seems yet cloudy, The mixture of politics might be dependent upon the circumstance, and agents, and constituencies involved; simply stated, the degree to which politics melds with policy depends.

Four Policy Authors' Policy Making Processes

The literature suggests that there are specific questions that must be answered, and sequential steps must be observed in order to ensure policy of quality design. Policy-makers must have the ability to make decisions accurately and logically that impact other decisions made along the way to policy fruition.

Several authors have found what might be considered typical processes of sequential steps to policy. Lindblom (1968) cited the following steps: "a) preliminary appraisal of or inquiring into the problems; b) identification of goals or objectives; c) canvassing of possible policies to achieve the goals; and d) choice or decision" (p. 4). Nagel's (1990) decision-making and/or policy process defines both problems and opportunities. He prescribed a five part decision-making process as: recognizing the situation, the policy agent must be aware that a problem and/or opportunity exists; framing the situation, the policy agent must define a problem and/or opportunity that is confronting the individual. The manner in which the situation is defined has paramount implications on future responses; searching for information, the policy agent must scrutinize copious information in memory or seek new information for ideas to approach the specific need; crafting policy for the

situation, the policy agent must craft strategies or courses of action aimed at a particular situation; and choosing the appropriate policy, the policy agent must choose suitable policy, and may include options from many alternatives or from only one identified option. Similar to the above mentioned policy authors, Hough (1984) offers a four steps process: issue emergence and problem identification, policy formulation and authorization, implementation, and termination or change. Offering the most comprehensive policy formation process, Hogwood and Peters (1983) presented a seven step process: agenda-setting--there is a perceived problem in society/organization requiring actions to correct them, policy formulation--policy instruments will be used to alleviate the perceived situation (problem/opportunity), legitimation--policy instruments are given authority through the state or other official action, organization--an organizational system is developed to deliver the policy, implementation--the administrative structure commits the policy to action, evaluation--the policy and its consequences (outputs) are analyzed and assessed according to some derived criteria, and termination--nothing more than cessation.[3]

As a special note, I would like to add that policy formation should not be considered separate from a decision making process: similar characteristics permeate both processes. Defining the "classical" model of rational decision making, Lindblom (1968) wrote

> 1. Faced with given problem, 2. rational man first clarifies his goals, values, or objectives, and then ranks or otherwise organizes them in his mind; 3. he then lists all important possible ways of--policies for--achieving his goal 4. and investigates all the important consequences that would follow from each of the alternative policies, 5. at which point he is in position to compare consequences of each policy with

goals 6. and so choose the policy with consequences most closely matching his goals. (p. 13)

The Policy Study Committee

The Illinois Higher Education International Education Act (P.A. 87-1179) was the catalyst and purpose for convening the Policy Study Committee (PSC). The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) was charged by the General Assembly to bring together a state-wide represented committee comprising professional people, state and federal representatives, large manufacturing companies, small and medium-sized companies, trade organizations and industry, public university and private college faculty, administration and students, and IBHE staff. The broad objective of the Committee was to serve as "stakeholders," to interpret P.A. 87-1179, and to create an action enabling policy document formalizing the legislative process. The purpose of this study was to investigate the P.A. 87-1179 policy formulation process. By investigating this policy formation process, I hoped to reveal specific intricacies or logical decision making processes about state level developed policy, thereby aiding current and future higher education and state policy-makers design educational policy. The literature review reveals many policy processes; however, it is important to recognize that the following policy process is but one success story.

Before proceeding, I should establish that a significant culmination of events occurred several years prior to convening the PSC, e.g., numerous 1980's international education legislative initiatives were proposed and failed; several senate resolutions and house bills were proposed, most failing; and finally, capping off a series of events, P.A. 87-1179 was legislated. The

purpose of the PSC was to develop state-wide higher education policy to support, operate, and manage the legislation

The End of the Legislative Process and the Beginning of the Policy Formation Process

As Senate Report 618 (SR 618) concluded, the policy development process began. The following section will describe in summary the events that occurred during the five Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) International Education Policy Study Committee (PSC) meetings, December 1992 through March 1994--when finally, the policy was accepted by the IBHE. Additionally, the following section will present the score of PSC events overlaid with the theoretic policy formation process developed from four policy authors' literature review.

Researcher's Observations: The Illinois Board of Higher Education International Education Policy Study Committee 's Summarized and Consolidated Meetings 1 through 5

The purpose of the Policy Study Committee (PSC) was to formulate international education policy to assist the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) in the guidance and management of Public Act 87-1179 (PA 87-1179) the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act.

◊Policy Formation Step 1--**Recognize** a Perceived Problem and/or Opportunity (Conditions)

Implications: The policy agent should **recognize** an opportunity to capitalize on, or problem to rectify occurs. An awareness of circumstances must exist. In order for the PSC to respond to the policy issue, their must be a perceived problem and/or opportunity to act on: to provide students with a global perspective in an ever-changing environment, and to reap potential

reviewed, organized and synthesized three times. A three page document resulted that included a set of prioritized recommendations that reflected the mandates set-forth in P.A. 87-1179 and fit within the framework of the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education (a principal guiding document of established goals and priorities and current IBHE priorities). Validating the process, each revision including the final draft was filtered through each institution's decision making organizational structure.

In final, PSC members were asked to consider the Committee's current policy proposals prior to the July 1993 meeting. Additionally, they were asked to reflect on the following: (a) the IBHE Chairperson's comments in relation to the IBHE's Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (PQP),[4] (b) alignment with private sector needs that are not strictly academic concerns, (c) student interest as job seekers in the workforce, (d) reallocation of resources necessary to implement recommended policies, and (e) funding issues. The PSC Chairperson completed the final draft of the preamble and policy, then secured approval from individual committee members in preparation for the March 1994 IBHE meeting.

◊Policy Formation Step 5--**Legitimation** of the Policy Document

• Implications: The policy agent should **legitimize** policy through the official authority of federal, state, municipal government, or educational institution, depending on the policy level and scope.

• Actions: Just as PA 87-1179 was legislated, the Illinois General Assembly asked the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) to convene a committee to address policy issues, thereby **legitimizing** the policy process to begin. Additionally, as the final policy draft was presented to the IBHE, the Board

Discussions focused on legislative intent; and (d) the Secretary of State. He was invited to make comments to the PSC, but he was unable to attend. However, his invite into the policy process was considered politically savvy. Illinois' former Chief of Staff, made comments on the Secretary of State's behalf, adding their support to the Committee and offering accolades for the PSC's international educative intent.

◊Policy Formation Step 4--**Crafting** or **Formulating** Policy.

•Implications: The policy agent should **develop** courses of action and strategies to handle the perceived conditions. As part of this step, the information is in hand and sorted through using the most accurate and timely data to formulate policy.

•Actions: Several month were spent **formulating** policy. In three out five PSC meetings, committee members processed policy ideas. As a beginning to the policy formation process, three categories provided the framework from which further policy would stem, those being (a) determination of international competency as a component of workforce preparation, (b) higher education addressing the need for global citizens, and (c) policy and educational outcomes. Recognizing the importance of the policy process, committee members discussed the need to present the policy document as something that would stand on its own, and not a part of other legislative mandates or policies. The PSC developed an "introductory" or "preamble" statement to introduce the topic and themes supported in the policy. The Committee believed that a preamble to the recommendations would alleviate any appearance that the policy was intended to be "tacked on" to any existing policy. Throughout the five meetings, the policy recommendations were

economic development benefits to the state via importing and exporting (trade).

•Actions: Public Act 87-1179 (PA 87-1179), the Illinois Higher Education International Education Act was the impetus (**recognized condition**) for convening the PSC, and of which permeated each of the five meetings.

◊Policy Formation Step 2--**Frame** the Problem/Opportunity (Conditions)

•Implications: The policy agent should correctly **frame** or **define** the opportunity/problem, and then specific goals and objectives of the circumstance are identified. How the perceived situation is analyzed impacts future responses. The policy conditions must be accurately **framed**: parameters of the situation established, then, specific goals and objectives identified.

•Actions: The PSC chairperson informed the committee members that they were representatives of the "stakeholders" in the international education policy-making process. The Committee's purpose was to develop policy that would satisfy the IBHE and serve as a guiding document for PA 87-1179. In order to accurately **frame** the conditions, the initial meetings served as guided brainstorming sessions in relation to the legislative mandates, the IBHE's demands, and responsibility to a broad constituency base. Additionally, and maybe more important, "international education" was defined along with its characteristics in relation to its operating environment. Adding "reality" and "validity" to the process, three key persons were invited to address the PSC: (a) the first addressee was the Deputy Director of the IBHE (this person was utilized throughout the course of the policy meetings' process). The deputy

ideas to the pool of policy knowledge, the PSC Chairperson reported to the Committee that the month prior he had spoken at a meeting of student representatives to the governing boards of each of the community colleges, private colleges and public universities in the state about P.A. 87-1179 and about the IBHE Policy Study Committee's work and purpose. The chairperson received valuable policy information from the student group about their curricular needs and the necessity to provide them an education that is globally competitive. The PSC chairperson suggested that the group select a spokesperson to represent student perspectives and to testify before the PSC in July.

3. (Also Policy Agents.) Including those individuals who are part of the political process is essential. The following persons provided the "reality check" and guidance for the content and direction of the policy. Each of the following four persons is a direct contact or has direct contact to the IBHE--the Governing Board that would eventually accept or reject the policy:
(a) the IBHE chairperson. He reinforced the IBHE's commitment to the international education initiative, provided his own interpretation of P.A. 87-1179, and stated what the law represented to the Board. The chairperson's comments carried special weight in influencing internal politics in support of international education within the Board and within the public universities under the Board's umbrella; (b) the Deputy Director of the IBHE. The deputy director discussed the Board's expectations, and general impressions of the legislation (as utilized in policy process step 2); (c) the Executive Director of the Citizen's Assembly of the Illinois General Assembly. The executive director represented the legislators who sponsored P.A. 87-1179.

crafting environment and confines of the authoritative management structure, as many policy informants should be utilized as possible.

•Actions: The PSC **consulted (searched) an array of informational sources**.

1. (Policy Agents, those who affect policy)--The PSC's knowledge base was a prime source of information and was comprised of public universities, independent and private colleges, large manufacturing companies, small and medium sized companies, trade organizations, professional people, as well as state and federal government, and student representatives.

2. (Targets Populations, those directly affected by policy)--The following four key informants provided invaluable support advice suggesting the types of attributes new graduates should possess upon entering the marketplace, and how education could faster and better prepare global minded employees: (a) The General Manager of Chicago's Hotel Nikko (also mentioned as part of policy step 2), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Japan Airlines; (b) the Corporate Vice President for Strategic Personnel Management at Motorola, in his role as representative of a multi-national corporation. The vice president provided practical information regarding the importance of international education in the universities as a facet of workforce preparation; (c) the President and CEO of Rollins Hudig Hall multi-national insurance brokerage company (also the IBHE Chairperson), added what he as an employer believes is needed for international workforce preparation and its importance to global competitiveness; and (d) the President of the Illinois World Trade Center (IWTC) reaffirmed the IWTC's commitment to, and support of the committee and its needs, and his belief that Illinois needs a globally educated citizenry supporting economic trade benefits to the state Adding additional

director discussed the Board's expectations, and general impressions of the legislation; (b) the second addressee was the Executive Director of the Citizen's Assembly of the Illinois General Assembly. The executive director represented the legislators who sponsored P.A. 87-1179. Discussions focused on legislative intent; and (c) the third addressee was the General Manager of Chicago's Hotel Nikko, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Japan Airlines. The general manager gave two examples of attributes that he likes to see in his employees and how U.S. education could assist in developing better employees for the hospitality service industry. Also aiding the **framing** condition's process, PSC members proceeded to review the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education--a principal guiding document of established goals and priorities, and current IBHE priorities. The Committee discussion focused on the timing of P.A. 87-1179 policy deliberations which paralleled the IBHE Priority, Quality, and Productivity (PQP) initiative.[4] Early in the process (by the second meeting) the PSC benefited the policy formulation process by fostering a framework, understanding: (a) the IBHE's view-point of how the law reads, and how the policy will serve as a road map to successful interpretation and implementation; (b) the politicians' legislative intent for international education, and how the committee could help to correct any perceived problems; and (c) the employer's view-point of what is desirable training for a "globally" minded workforce.

◊Policy Formation Step 3--**Search** New Ideas as Well as Old Ideas

•Implications: The policy agent **canvasses** old and new information for policy ideas to achieve established goals. Within the framework of the policy

approved the document, again, **legitimizing** the policy to be implemented as an official policy document.

◊Policy Formation Step 6--Develop a **Structured Delivery System**

•Implications: The policy agent should construct and **organize a system for delivering** the policy.

•Actions: Under the governance of the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), the international education legislation and policy have an official **structured delivery system** for policy. The structured delivery system was already in place as the formal organizational chart, or decision making structure. (Refer to Figure 2)

◊ Policy Formation Steps 7, 8, 9, & 10--**Implement, Evaluate, Change, and/or Terminate** the Policy

•Implication: The policy agent (administrative structure) should **commit to action/implement** that reflects the policy, **evaluate** the policy according to a predetermined set of criteria, and **change or alter** the policy if certain criteria are not met. Policy can be altered to answer a situation, or policy changes can be successive in nature: The latter, in fact, starts the process over again. Finally, **terminate** the policy if necessary. Termination is the complete shutdown or cessation of policy.

•Actions: The remaining **implementation, evaluation, policy change**, and **termination** is not presented in relation to this research.[5]

Discussion and Conclusions

In the state of Illinois, the 1980s ushered in a decade of failed international education legislative initiatives. Conversely, as a result of careful politics and skillfully framing pertinent and specific issues, the early

1990s produced the first mandated higher education international education legislation. The legislative intent was to combat a perceived failure on the part of the educational system to produce a "global-minded" citizenry capable of competing in a world-scale market economy, ultimately, resulting in economic benefits to Illinois state businesses through international commerce (exports and imports). After legislating PA 87-1179, key policy agents recognized that in order for its policy document to be effectively implemented, visual and tangible support was needed from the IBHE by acknowledging the importance of the topic (international dimension to higher education),
recognizing the importance of rhetoric (openly discussing), recognizing the importance of creating written policy document supporting the efforts of the Committee, and showing institutional support (commitment to the cause).

The policy formation preparatory work began as early as the beginning of 1991. The formal policy formulation process began in December 1992 and ended in July 1993, and was officially accepted by the Illinois Board of Higher Education on March 1, 1994.

In conclusion, the research results indicated consistencies between the two policy processes (Policy authors' literature review and PSC policy formation process) steps 1 through 6.[5] In accord with the four authors' policy formation processes, the PSC followed a logical and methodical path to policy fruition whether or not committee members were aware of the structured policy formation process. The Policy Study Committee was effective to the extent that it crafted a higher education international education policy mandated by the Illinois General Assembly via the Illinois Board of Higher

Education. However, to the extent the policy is effective remains to be seen as it is implemented and evaluated. Refering back to Nagel's (1990) three policy diagnostics for successful design, the PSC policy process contained those elements of (a) support, (b) knowledge, and
(c) capacity and incentive. The following listing reveals the successful characteristics of the PSC policy process, and supports and exceeds Nagel's prescribed diagnostics formula.

1. Based on this investigation, having one impartial person (policy process ownership should be considered) coordinating and controlling the entire policy process proved effective. The process demands considerable time, attention, and work, and requires the focus of one person, given the appropriate authority and delegative powers. Also, one impartial coordinating person is necessary because too many coordinating factions might confuse the process and weaken unity. Many opinions are good for policy in the data search step, however, one person needs to organize those opinions to avoid unnecessary political strife.

2. Based on this investigation, the PSC had the **support** of a wide array of policy agents and policy target populations encompassing state level officials, the higher education governing board (IBHE), individual institutions, Illinois businesses, and students. More specifically speaking, those providing direct individual support were: (a) policy agents--the Policy Study Committee, the Deputy Director of the IBHE, the Chairperson the IBHE, the Illinois Secretary of State via the former Chief of Staff, and the Executive Director of the Citizen's Assembly of the Illinois General Assembly; and (b) policy target populations--the General Manager of Chicago's Hotel Nikko, the Corporate

Vice President for Strategic Personnel Management at Motorola, the President and CEO of Rollins Hudig Hall multi-national insurance brokerage company, the President of the Illinois World Trade Center, and a student representative group to the governing boards of each of the community colleges, private colleges, and public universities. Establishing supportive policy, confidence was shown by (a) state leadership asking to develop policy, (b) policy agents and target populations participating in the process, and (c) IBHE accepting the policy and mandating its directives.

3. Based on this investigation, an array of policy agents and policy target populations (as stated above) contributed **knowledge** to the policy data search. Remember, policy is as good as the data it is based on. Both policy agent and target population groups provided enough perceived accurate and reliable information to formulate a well package policy.

4. Based on this investigation, both policy agent and target population groups have the **capacity** to implement the policy, given the support of the state, governing board, and individual institutions. Debatable though is the incentive and motivation to act. The policy does not clearly inspire action through a well espressed reward nor punishment system. If a policy tool exists with the parameters of this policy, it is through the IBHE's system of monitoring institutions and providing additional grants and resources, etc. to those adhering to the policy directives.

In closure, what remains to be seen is "when" and "if" the policy has been implemented, "how" it has affected the Illinois higher education system, and "how" it will be evaluated, changed or terminated. To bring full closure

to this investigation, I recommend that follow-up research be conducted charting policy progress.

Figure 1

POLICY FORMATION PROCESS

(1) **Recognition**--The policy agent should recognize an opportunity to capitalize on, or problem to rectify occurs. An awareness of circumstance must exist.

(2) **Framing**--The policy agent should correctly define the opportunity/problem, and then specific goals and objectives of the circumstance are identified. How the perceived situation is analyzed impacts future responses.

(3) **Search**--The policy agent should canvass old and new information for policy ideas to achieve established goals.

(4) **Crafting/ Policy Formulation**--The policy agent should develop course(s) of action and of strategies to handle the perceived circumstance.

(5) **Legitimation**--The policy agent should legitimize policy through the official authority of federal, state, municipal government, or institution, depending on the policy level and scope.

(6) **Structured Delivery System**--The policy agent should construct and organize a system for delivering the policy.

(7) **Implementation**--The policy agent (administrative structure) should commit to action that reflects the policy.

(8) **Evaluation**--The policy agent should evaluate policy according to a predetermined set of criteria.

(9) **Policy Change**--The policy agent could change or alter the policy if the certain criteria are not met. Policy can be altered to answer situation, or policy changes can be successive in nature. The latter may in fact start the process over again.

(10) **Termination**--The policy agent could terminate the policy if necessary. Termination is the complete shutdown or cessation of the policy.

Figure 2 Policy Structured Delivery System

State Officials (Illinois)/P.A. 87-1179
|
International Policy Study Committee Policy Via IBHE
|
Institutional Governing/ Coordinating Board (Board of Trustees, Board of Governors, Board of Regents)
|
Institution Chancellor/ President (Institution Mission Statements and Policy Statements)
|
Department and College Policy and Mission Statements
(Vice Presidents, Deans, Faculty, Chairpersons, Directors, and Coordinators).

Notes

1. Several of the commissions and reports cited U.S. students' general lack of international knowledge, competence, and savvy. The following myriad of publications and associations exemplify the call for international education efforts: the National Governors Association (NGA); The President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (1979); Toward Education with a Global Perspective (National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1980); The Rockefeller Commission on Humanities (1980); Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do (College Entrance Examination Board, 1983); Action for Excellence (Education Commission of the United States, 1983); Educating Americans for the 21st Century (National Science Board (U.S.) Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, 1983); Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform (United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983); Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (National Institute of Education, 1984); Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies (Lambert, Richard, Association of American Universities, 1984); To Reclaim a Legacy: Report on the Humanities in Higher Education (Bennett, William, National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984); Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community (Association of American Colleges, 1985); the AIEA's document titled, Action for International Competence (1988); The American Council on Education's report, International Studies and the Undergraduate (1989); Guidelines for International Education at U.S. Colleges and Universities (AIEA, 1989); also, proposals prepared by groups such as, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEOs), the Council on International Exchange (CIE), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and the Association of American Universities (AAU).

2. In brief, an educational indicator system assists policy makers by keeping them abreast of the health of the institution. It is a monitoring system that gauges performance, conditions, and circumstances that can impact final results (Oakes 1986, Nuttall 1990, and Archbald 1996).

3. The theoretic policy formation model is an ideal type of policy formulation process eclectically selected from Lindblom's (1968), Hogwood and Peters' (1983), Hough's (1984), and Nagel's (1990) policy/decision making processes. (Refer to Figure 1.)

4. Priority, Quality, and Productivity (PQP) is an initiative acknowledging that the priorities of Illinois higher education are being monitored by the Illinois Board of Higher

Education (IBHE) in its effort to guide resource allocations according to priorities established by the IBHE institutions.

5. This article was written without knowledge of the current status of the P.A. 87-1179 policy implementation, evaluation, change, or termination processes (steps 7-10).

REFERENCES

Archbald, D. (1996, March). Measuring school choice using indicators. Educational Policy, 10 (1).

Audas, M. C. (1991). Comparing statements and practices in the international dimension of selected institutions of higher education. International Education Forum, 11 (2), 86-108.

Backman, E. L. (Ed.). (1984). Approaches to international education. New York: MacMillan.

Caws, P., Ripley, S. D., & Ritterbush, P. C. (Eds.). (1972). Regaining the policy initiative in the modern university. The bankruptsy of academic policy, 1 (3), 41-62.

Christensen, R. C., Berg, N. A., & Salter, M. S. (1980). Policy formulation and administration. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Davies, J. L. (1985). The use of mission statements in policy formation and planning. International Journal of institutional Management in Higher Education, 9 (2), 129-139.

Good, C. V. (1973), Dictionary of education. New York: McGraw-Hill

Gove, S. K. & Stauffer, T. M. (Eds.). (1986). Policy controversies in higher education. New York: Greenwood Press.

Hogwood, B., & Peters, B. G. (1983). Policy dynamics. Great Britain: Harvester Press Group.

Hough, J. R. (Ed.). (1984). Educational policy: An international survey. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kaplan, R. B. (1987, Spring). Foreign students: Developing institutional policy. The College Board Review, (143), 7-9, & 28-30.

McKelvie, B. D. (1986). The university statement of goals. Higher Education, 15, 151-163.Lindblom, C. (1968). The policy making process. Englewood, New Jersey: Princeton-Hall, Inc.

Nagel, S. S. (Ed.). (1990). Policy theory and policy evaluation concepts, knowledge, causes and norms. New York: Greenwood.

Nuttall, D. L. (1990). The functions and limitations of international educational indicators. International Journal of Education Research, 14 (4), 327-333.

Oakes, J. (1986). Educational indicators: A guide for policymakers. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation for the Centre for Policy Research in Education.

Ping, C. J. (1990, June). Strategies and leadership options for effective internationalization. Paper presented at the national conference for university presidents and other senior administrators, Washington State University, (Internationalizing U. S. Universities: A Time for Leadership). Spokane, Washington.